



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

avowed fact that out of the Catholic Church there is no visible unity."—Resumé, page 14.

Dr. M.—The silence of Scripture respecting any doctrine is a decisive argument against its truth. Contemporary historians would scarcely omit, if writing for posterity, facts of prime importance, as being too well known to be mentioned. But your parallel assumes the fact which is wholly denied—namely, that infallibility and primacy were known at all. There is very decisive evidence afforded by Mr. Newman's doctrine of development, that all early history is against you; for it is a plain declaration on his part, that the doctrines of the Church of Rome, as they now exist, cannot be found in the records of the early Church. Their germs only are, on this theory, to be found either in the Bible or in such records. These were subsequently to be expanded or developed. This settles your assertion that the facts were too well known to be mentioned; for it admits that the present doctrines of your Church were not known at all. Moreover, would not that historian be judged unfaithful, who, when writing for future ages, should omit most important facts which they could not know except through history. Acting thus, although the circumstance which he was describing called expressly for mention of such facts, still more would he be to be reprehended were he, though aware of their importance to futurity, not only to suppress but apparently to supplant them by other statements very difficult to be reconciled with them.

Nothing can be safer than your rule—"In extracting doctrines from the Bible it was always necessary to compare one part with another." It is precisely because such comparison of passages, as well as the separate examination of each, negatives your peculiar doctrines that we, Protestants, reject them.

You say, "that in the whole counsel of God, preached by St. Paul, no doubt entered the necessity of submission to one visible head &c." This is, of course, a mere assertion, plainly without a shadow of proof. Nay, more, it is not only irreconcilable with the systematic silence of Paul in all his epistles, but against the clear witness of those several instances where he makes express mention of Peter. He wrote fourteen epistles. He treated of discipline, and delivered doctrine. He is, in every case, silent on the infallibility and supreme jurisdiction of the Church or Peter, though the circumstances which he mentions were just the fitting occasions to enforce these doctrines, if they were true.

The beloved Apostle, St. John, is another witness against you. He lived until the end of the first century, presiding over the seven Asiatic Churches. During his lifetime there were several succeeding Roman bishops. If your imagined prerogatives of St. Peter were transmitted to imagined successors in the See of Rome, it would follow that the inspired Apostle, John, must have been inferior in spiritual privileges, and subordinate in authority to successive bishops of Rome.

Mr. G.—So he was.*

Dr. M.—Now, you directly contradict the Scriptures, which declare, "God hath set some in the Church. First Apostles (1 Cor. xii. 28), secondarily, &c." Here it is very clear from the context, that "first" includes foremost in dignity. This could not be if, as you say, St. John, though an Apostle, was subordinate to the bishops of Rome, who were successively his contemporaries, and who were not Apostles.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

IS THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND SCHISMATICAL?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Carlow, October 29, 1854.

SIR—I take the liberty of resuming a correspondence that I had with you last August, on the title "Catholic." In answer to your strictures on my last letter, you say, that "the Irish Protestant Church does not owe its existence to any act of separation, which has never committed any act of schism;" and you say this is the Church to which Christians of this country ought to belong.

If I am to understand, by the foregoing, that the present Protestant Church of Ireland is identical with the Church of Ireland four hundred years ago, I am wonderfully deceived. In the first place, what is a separation, but simply a change of belief from one set of opinions to that of another, and I call this a separation, more or less, according to the nature of opinions changed; to use a military phrase, you have circumscribed our field of action, therefore the fight will be more decisive.

In Bede's Eccl. Hist., bib. 1st., you will find that Celestine, Pope of Rome, sent Palladius to convert the Irish, and afterwards St. Patrick.—See, also, St. Prosper, Chron. St. Columbanus calls the Pope his master, the steersman, the mystic pilot.

The ancient monasteries, and the remains of other holy buildings, with their crumbling altars, holy water fountains,

* I am pretty sure it was Mr. Gretton who gave this answer, which is in strict harmony with, or rather a necessary consequence of the inheritance of St. Peter's asserted privileges; and is, therefore, because of its absurdity, a refutation of them. Mr. Langdon, on another occasion, replied to me—"We have one (the Bishop of Rome) just as good as St. Paul!"

stone crosses, the chalices of ancient times yet in the land, and the remains of other church plate with monkish devices thereon, fairly indicate, beyond a shadow of doubt, that they belong to another and different religion to the one now occupying the land, having the title "Irish Protestant Church, or Church of England and Ireland." St. Bridget and her abbey, her religious houses, and virgins of her pious order—where are her followers to be seen in the Protestant Church of England and Ireland? Where? Oh, yes, I could multiply testimony on testimony of the non-existence of this new and alien Church, from this fertile land of Catholic antiquity; and oh, I could trace the changes of religion, aye, painfully too, and as true as it is painful. When Patrick became our island saint, it was with crozier in hand, with a halo round his path, and a blessing marked his footsteps, and he onward came, the apostle of peace, an image of his Heavenly Master, and he evangelized the land. Thenceforward Ireland became like Rome in Paul's days; their faith and piety, and learning, were spoken of throughout the world.

We can learn from ancient historians and their contemporaries that Ireland, from Patrick to the British rule, kept up a faithful and submissive chain of correspondence with the Pontiff at Rome. In my next letter, please God, if you will, I shall enter more largely and in detail, peering my way, by strict, undeniable, historical information, that will leave a reasonable impression on the minds of your readers that I have not begun this correspondence empty-handed as regards "proof positive" of the justness of my cause.

I am, dear sir, yours respectfully,

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Our correspondent appears to us to confound the obvious distinction between "opinions" and "actions." We admit, that at the Reformation, the Church of Ireland changed many erroneous opinions; we deny that it committed any act of separation or schism. Our correspondent thinks that he disproves this statement by saying, that, at the time of the Reformation, the Irish Church did alter some of its opinions. But this is no contradiction to what we said; as far as it goes, it exactly agrees with what we said. If our correspondent wants to contradict what we said, he must show what act of separation or of schism the Irish Church committed at the time of the Reformation. This he does not attempt to do; and we are justified in supposing that he does not attempt to point to any act of the kind, simply because he can find no act of the kind to point to. We feel sure that if our correspondent could point out any act of separation or schism committed by the Church of Ireland, on any particular day, or in any particular place, he would not fail to do so. Until he can point out such an act, it is useless for him to affirm that such acts have been committed.

All he attempts to do is to affirm that, in his opinion, every change of opinion is an act of separation. With the history of the Church before us, we think such an opinion quite untenable. We recommend our correspondent to change that opinion at once; and in doing so, he will find, by his own personal experience, that changing an opinion does not necessarily involve any act of separation. Surely he can change this untenable opinion without separating from any body. If other people separate from him because he changes it, the act of separation will be committed by them, and not by him. This was precisely the case of the Irish Church at the Reformation. She changed some erroneous opinions; and for that the Bishop of Rome separated from her, and persuaded as many as he could to do the same; but she committed no act of separation. If she did, let our correspondent point out the when, and where, and how.

In the third century, St. Cyprian and the African Church held a totally opposite opinion to Pope Stephen and the Church of Rome, in a matter which the Council of Trent treats as a question of faith—viz., the rebaptizing of heretics. Does our correspondent mean to say that St. Cyprian and the African Church at that time committed any act of separation from the communion of the Church of Rome? All history is against such a notion.

Under the guidance of St. Augustine, the African Church altered that erroneous opinion, and adopted another, opposed to St. Cyprian, and equally opposed to Pope Stephen. The whole Church has since adopted the opinion of St. Augustine. Does our correspondent mean to say that the Church of Africa, by correcting that error, did separate from herself or from any other? If he think so, let him say it. But if he feel, as he must, that such an assertion would be false and absurd, with what truth or reason can he say that every change of opinion or belief must needs be an act of separation?

We will give him one instance more. Respecting the Immaculate Conception, Bishop Milner says—"The Church does not decide the controversy concerning the conception of the Blessed Virgin, and several other disputed points, because she sees nothing absolutely clear and certain concerning them, either in the written or the unwritten Word."

—End of Controversy, letter xii. The present Pope, Pius IX., has confirmed this in his letter of February 2, 1849, in which he distinctly admits, that "this honour has not yet been decreed to the most Holy Virgin by the Church and the Apostolic See." It is clear, therefore,

* For this letter, see the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. 1., No. 1, January, 1852.

that, up to the present time, the Church of Rome has been of opinion that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, whether true or false, is not an article of the Christian faith which all men are bound to believe. But the Church of Rome is now going to change this opinion. On the 8th day of December next, the Church of Rome will decide that this doctrine is an article of the Christian faith, which all are bound to believe. Now, when the Church of Rome shall have thus changed her opinion about no less a question than whether a certain doctrine be an article of the Christian faith or no, will our correspondent then be ready to say that the Church of Rome of December will have separated from the Church of Rome of November? We think the Church of Rome will have changed its opinion for the worse, and will have still further corrupted the Catholic faith; but we do not see that any act of separation will be thereby committed, or will necessarily follow; although we are quite clear that if any members of the Church of Rome should thereupon separate from her, on the ground that she had corrupted the faith, they would be quite justified in doing so.

We hope our correspondent now understands the difference between altering an opinion and committing an act of separation. Actions may follow from opinions; but it does not therefore follow that opinions are actions. An act of separation may follow from a change of opinion, or it may not. To say that a Church has changed some opinions, can never be a proof that that Church has committed an act of separation, until that act of separation can be pointed out. Let our correspondent, therefore, show us when, and where, and how, the Irish Church derived its existence from an act of separation or schism, or ever committed such an act?

Our correspondent says, at the end of his letter—"That Ireland, from Patrick to the British rule, kept up a faithful and submissive chain of correspondence with the Pontiff at Rome." Now, it is our opinion that if our correspondent was at all acquainted with ancient Irish Church history, he would never have ventured on so rash an opinion as this. However, as he promises to write to us again upon this subject, we will keep our observations upon that point till we hear from him again. And we hope he will not fail to perform that promise.

ON PURGATORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—If it be allowed to notice some of your leading arguments against the doctrine of Purgatory, I shall, in the first instance, respectfully direct attention to CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., p. 81, where, with respect to "W. C. Search," quoting Tertullian, you say—"We are surprised he should venture to do so." Again—"Now, the fact is, that both the passages which 'W. C. S.' quotes from Tertullian, are both taken from books written after he became a Montanist and a heretic!" Then, you ask—"Is it not strange that men who call themselves Catholics should turn away from what Tertullian believed while he was yet a Catholic, and preach to us only the deadly heresies he fell into after he had left the Catholic Church?" Again, you pointedly ask—"Why do they (Catholics) not quote to us Mahomet and the Koran?" Your opinion, thus dogmatically expressed, decides the character of these two books of Tertullian; they are thus declared by your fiat, to contain only the heretical and impious doctrines of Montanus; yet, immediately after, you tell us—"the first passage (De Corona Militis, p. 209) speaks only of offering for the dead;" thence, we are to conclude from your own arguments, that offering for the dead is a part of the heresy of Montanus. With respect to the passage I have referred to, I perceive that you and Mr. Collette are in the antipodes of opinion; but, in your charge on Purgatory, perfectly unanimous. In CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 86, Mr. Collette says—"Tertullian speaks of a custom then existing in the Church among some Christians." In page 87, he admits, that in this book, which you stigmatize as heretical, and no better authority than the Koran, and in the identical chapter from which "W. C. S." quotes, Tertullian has enumerated certain usages of the Church (not the impious heresies of Montanus), and among them oblations for the dead, on the anniversary days of their heavenly birth." This passage he further vindicates, and thus establishes its genuine character beyond exception, by collateral and corroborating passages from St. Cyprian's epistles; and, in doing so, he has evolved no mystery, enunciated no new principles, but only given us what is the teaching of the Catholic Church now, as well as in the days of St. Augustine; that prayers and sacrifice offered for the Apostles, martyrs, &c., and for all those whose lives are very good, acts out of thanksgiving; yet, from this principle, Mr. Collette undertakes to disprove the doctrine of Purgatory! And, in order to make this conclusion available to the end he proposes, he tells those for whose edification he writes, by an egregious mistake, no doubt, that, "according to the modern Roman doctrine, all the faithful—all those who die in the faith of Christ—go to Purgatory, before they can be in a fit condition to appear before God!" But the poor gentleman has been reckoning without his host. I wish he had informed us where and how and from whom he has learned this novel feature of modern Roman theology. In CATHOLIC LAYMAN, December, 1852, page 141, col. i., I observe you fell into a like mistake; you say, "whenever Roman

Catholics read any prayers for the dead, or any commemoration of the dead, they always take for granted, that it must be for getting the souls of the dead out of Purgatory." Now, I ask you, and let me have a fair reply? Where do you find that Catholics hold such a belief? Again, in same page, you say—"Well, then, when we read of any sacrifice or commemoration for a dead person, in the early Church, what right has any Roman Catholic to say, that this is proof that that person was in Purgatory, and that sacrifice or commemoration could not be for any other purpose than getting the soul out of Purgatory?" I answer, he has no right at all to say so; his religion teaches him that such sacrifice, &c., could be, have been, and still continue to be offered for another purpose. You continue—"If the Church of Rome now thinks, that there are any other reasons for offering her sacrifice and making her commemorations now, for souls that are not in Purgatory, much more might the early Church offer her very different sacrifice, &c., for souls that she never believed to be in Purgatory." That the sacrifice offered by the early Church of Rome differed from that offered by the modern Church of Rome, remains to be yet proved; in this respect, the Church of England does not agree with either of them; she offers no sacrifice at all, either for the living or the dead. This she proves for me thus—"We must, then, take heed, lest, of the memory, it be made a sacrifice; lest, of a communion, it be made a private eating; lest, of two parts, we have but one; lest, applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive."—*Homily of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament*, 2nd book Homilies, page 375. Next you say—"How absurd, then, for any Roman Catholic now to say, that sacrifice and commemoration for the dead cannot be for any other purpose besides getting the soul out of Purgatory?" You love to harp upon this string; your starting note is still the same; but I fancy I will spoil the tune, by referring you to CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., p. 83, col. 1, where "J. B." quotes from the "Sincere Christian Instructed," &c., thus—"Question: For whom is the Mass offered? Answer: For those in heaven, in thanksgivings to God for all their happiness, for the Church on earth, &c., and for the souls in Purgatory." In order to evade the force of this plain statement, you have no course left, save the old mistake; and the whole force of your argument is, that "we rely on this gross absurdity," which you cannot deny to be "contradicted even by our own practice."

To contradict every word of your mistaken arguments, I will have recourse to no more mighty authority than yourself; I mean your severe animadversions on the Catholic Church for her faithful record of a number of holy personages, in every age, since the Apostles, whose heroic sanctity and supernatural virtues shone forth with a heavenly effulgence that cannot be disputed. In illustration, I will select St. Bernard, of the twelfth century, and I will ask you, did Catholics ever contradict their practice by praying for him, as if he should pass through Purgatory on his way to heaven? The same I repeat with respect to the holy St. Francis Xavierius, the Apostle of the Indies? You decried the Church of Rome for thus paying a just tribute to the exalted virtues of numbers of her children, and thus you establish the fact, that the Church of Rome believes and teaches, that many of her members go to heaven without passing through Purgatory. And to pray for a saint, with the notion that he was in need of the suffrages of the Church, can be no more repugnant to Catholic doctrine, than it would be to offer sacrifice and prayers for the damned; and St. Augustine says, that even in this case, "though they afford no relief to the dead, they are an advantage to the living."—*Enchiridion* cap. ex., t. vi., p. 238. The Church of England, you say (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 71), "honours the undoubted saints of the primitive Church;" you might add, she honours King Charles I. in the same way, and even with the highest honour—that of a martyr. What is allowed in the Church of England in this respect, cannot be refused to the Church of Rome. Luther grants, in *Apol. Resp.*, ad. Arg. p. 99, that St. Anthony, St. Bernard, St. Dominick, and St. Francis, though all members of the Church of Rome, are to be numbered among the saints; deny, if you can, that they have not as good a title to this distinction as many of those in your calendar.

The second passage (Monogam, cap. x., page 155) cited by "W. C. S." may, I consider, be fairly assumed to be genuine, and to enunciate, as well as the first, a practice of the Catholic Church; and this assumption is fully warranted by a corroborating passage from St. Cyprian, *Epist. xlvii.*, page 114. The widow is not said here to offer a thanksgiving that her husband "is now placed, liberated in the presence of God, to hold fast without delay a heavenly kingdom;" but she prays, supplicates, and offers sacrifice, to seek a favour for him; the idea of which is to be conceived from the general term *refrigerium*, to which, in the passage of Cyprian, the term *dormitio* affords an exact parallel. That the prayers and sacrifice offered in the early Church, for the Apostles, martyrs, &c., were purely commemorative and acts of thanksgiving, and materially different, as to their object, from those offered for the ordinary dead, is fully evinced by St. Cyril in his explanation of the Liturgy. He says—"When that spiritual sacrifice, that unbloody worship is finished, we supplicate God, over this victim of propitiation, for the common peace of the Church, &c., &c. We all beseech thee, and we offer this sacrifice

to thee, that we may commemorate all those who have died before us; in the first place, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, that God, through their prayers and intercessions, may receive our supplications." Thus, he inculcates the invocation and intercession of saints, with as much perspicuity as that dogma hath been defined by the Council of Trent, *Sess. xxv.*; as an integral portion of Catholic doctrine, set forth in the liturgical offices of the Church—through this medium they offered up their supplications, even for the other dead. For, the saint continues, "then we pray for our deceased holy fathers and bishops, and, lastly, for all our departed, believing that the souls receive great advantage, for whom supplication is offered up in the celebration of the holy and tremendous sacrifice."—*Myst. v.*, page 328. The *refrigerium* of Tertullian, the *dormitio* of Cyprian, and the *μνησιν Ονησιν* of Cyril are, evidently, as many different modes of expressing this "advantage;" and, hence, they are strictly explicable in one particular sense only; and, as they all express the object supplicated for the dead in the sacrifice of the altar, the language of the Liturgy must determine their precise meaning. In the Liturgy of St. James, tom. ii., Bib. Patr., Paris, 1624, p. 11., the priest, in offering the sacrifice, entreats God to receive it *εὐς ἀναπαύσιν των προκεκοιμημένων ψυχών*. That *ἀναπαύσιν* means rest, relief, &c., from pain, torment, &c., is beyond contradiction—*Apoc. xiv. 11.* *Approved version*. "And they have no rest day or night," &c.,—*καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀναπαύσιν ημερᾶς καὶ νυκτός*, &c.—Greek Testament. That it means the rest enjoyed in heaven by the blessed, in contradistinction to all pain, trouble, persecution, &c., is proved from v. 13—*ὅτι ἀναπαύσονται ἐκ των κοπων αυτων*—"that they may rest from their labours," &c. Thus, in the 2nd and 3rd centuries we see the Church offering sacrifices for the relief of the dead, for their repose, rest, &c.; this doctrine explained by St. Cyril, in the 4th century, and confirmed, not alone by the Liturgy of St. James, but by all the ancient Liturgies. Moreover, in addition to prayers and sacrifice for the dead, we see, that as early as the year 350, the Church supplicates God through the intercession of the saints, with many other practices as papistical as anything in the present day; and how the Fathers and doctors of the Church, at whatever period these novel doctrines were introduced, could conspire to cajole the Christian world out of their Church, in which, according to the doctors of the Church of England, they had no sacrifice, no intercession of saints, no prayers, &c., for the relief and repose of the dead; and how such a change was effected, so secretly that no one could detect it, and, yet strange, without their knowing it, all became arrant Papists; and, at what time this revolution took place, with the names of the innovators, and the principal details of the event, I beg you will inform me. St. Cyril says, with regard to prayers for the Patriarchs, &c.—*ὡς μνημονεύομεν*—that we may celebrate their memory; but of the other dead he says, supplication is offered for them—*ἡ δεήσις ἀναφέρεται*. The same distinction is observed in all the Liturgies. This distinction you have endeavoured throughout, to confound. The restoring of *pro natalitiis* (De Corona Militis, p. 209) is of the utmost importance, as by the use of it we can discern, even in the Church of the second century, a recognition of the distinction I have just noticed: a distinction between the oblations and sacrifices to celebrate the memory of the martyrs who "have arrived at the presence of the Lord, the Lord himself rejoicing," and those offered by the widow to supplicate relief for her husband's soul—a distinction confirmed by the testimony of the most eminent Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. St. Epiphanius says—"We pray for the just and sinners in quite a different manner, &c., that for the latter we may obtain mercy" (*ἐλεους θεου δεόμενοι*).—*Har. lxxv.*, t. 1, p. 911; and in the same manner the other Fathers.

Are we, then, to conclude, I ask you, that all the Fathers, in this respect, taught only the impious and deadly heresies of Montanus; and that Aetius, who maintained that the prayers, alms, &c., of the living did no good for the dead; "and that we must not pray or sacrifice for them; that the solemn fasts appointed by the Church should not be kept, and that every one was to fast as he pleased; that he might not seem to be under the law" (St. Augustin, *Lib. de Har. liii.*, &c.); are we, I ask you, to believe that Aetius was the only living portion of Christ's Church to be found then in the world? for, the more than incipient doctrines of Popery had, as I have already shown, taken deep root throughout Christendom. The noxious sacrifice of the Mass differs nothing from the sacrifice of the early Church as explained by St. Cyril, in the paragraph immediately preceding my first citation from him; he says—"We invoke the most benign God to send down the Holy Spirit on the things offered, to make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ—*ὡς ποιῆσθαι τον μεν αρτον σωμα Χριστου, τονδε οινον αιμα Χριστου*. All the ancient Liturgies invariably agree with St. Cyril; having the words *ποιῆσθαι αρτον, αναδειξαι, ποιῆσθαι, ποιῆσθαι*, &c., all of which express precisely the action, to make, to render, &c., the bread the body, &c.; whilst the prayer of consecration in the Ritual of the Church of England make the bread and wine to be totally different things from the body and

blood of Christ. The oblations made in the early Church appear to be very different from *doles* to the poor; St. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, who was himself the disciple of St. John the Evangelist, says—"Christ giving instructions to his disciples, to offer their first fruits to God, &c., he took bread into his hands, and, giving thanks, said, 'this is my body.' Likewise he declared the cup to be his blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Testament." And, again—"therefore, the oblation of the Church, which the Lord taught to be offered in the whole world, was deemed a pure sacrifice before God."—*Adv. Hær. Lib. ix.*, cap. xviii., p. 251. He generally uses the word *oblato* for the sacrifice of the altar, but never in the sense of a *dole* to the poor; hence, it is plain, that the *oblato*nes *pro defunctis* of Tertullian and the early Fathers must be understood of the sacrifice of the altar, offered for the living and the dead.

Your arguments, as already remarked, as far as I have considered them, are formed on a wrong principle, and are, therefore, utterly inconclusive; and Mr. Collette's are, on the same account, equally so. All your other statements, including your citations from St. Augustine, shall in due course be fairly and candidly disposed of; when it will be made to appear that all these, as well as those noticed, are equally fallacious.

Although I have far exceeded my proper limits, I cannot omit noticing another mistake of yours, in CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iii., p. 71, col. 1, where you quote a passage, from Council of Trent, *Sess. xxv.*, *de Invocatione Sanctorum*, so thoroughly eviscerated, and in such a mutilated and spurious shape, that the original could not be recognised; and instead of explaining Catholic doctrine, goes to establish as deadly a heresy as ever could be inspired by the father of lies—a heresy from which Origen defended the Church against the attacks of Celsus. You make us pray directly to the saints, as by them alone to obtain favour from God. This, though not connected with the other portion of my letter, I thought essentially necessary to observe.

You will kindly accept my endeavours to elucidate the truth as an apology for this long essay.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

EDMOND POWER.

Sept. 30, 1854.

We are afraid it will not prove very satisfactory, to such of our readers as are seeking for truth, to have their time and our space occupied by a discussion which they can scarcely understand or appreciate, without taking the trouble of reading again, a long past discussion of two years ago; and we feel some apology is due for asking them to do so. We must beg them, however, to remember that it is Mr. Power who has dragged them into it, and not we; and we cannot help observing, that that gentleman, with whom we had so many earnest discussions upon the doctrine of Purgatory, must be rather hard pressed for arguments, in support of his opinions, when, after six months' consideration and ransacking our pages, from vol. i., p. 81, to vol. iii., p. 86, he has been able to take hold of nothing more worthy of criticism than a supposed discrepancy between our views and that of our respected correspondent, Mr. Collette. So far from that criticism affecting our "leading arguments" against the doctrine of Purgatory, we are satisfied, if Mr. Power will only consider a little more carefully the nature of the arguments which we have used about the proof of Purgatory, he will himself see that he is, in fact, proving the truth and force of our own observations; and we are truly glad to have our arguments supported by so intelligent a writer. To make this more clear, we must take leave to repeat the passage to which we allude in his letter.

After citing correctly a passage from our columns, in page 141, vol. i., in the following words—"Well, then, when we read of any sacrifice or commemoration for a dead person in the early Church, what right has any Roman Catholic to say, that this is proof that that person was in Purgatory, and that such sacrifice or commemoration could not be for any other purpose than getting the soul out of Purgatory," Mr. Power goes on to say, "I answer, he has no right at all to say so. His religion teaches him that such sacrifice, &c., could be, have been, and still continue to be, offered for another purpose." Now, what is this but exactly what we have so often said, that prayers or sacrifices for the dead do not prove Purgatory, even by way of implication, because they "could be, and actually are offered for another purpose?" We are quite satisfied with this answer, and only hope that Mr. Power will have the candour not to attempt hereafter to withdraw the admission how far he really agrees with us.

With respect to Tertullian our correspondent hardly treats us candidly. It is true we did say, in vol. i., p. 81, "Is it not strange that men, who call themselves Catholics, should turn away from what Tertullian believed while he was yet a Catholic, and preach to us only the deadly heresies he fell into after he had left the Catholic Church." But Mr. Power takes no notice of the fact which led us to say this; yet it was a remarkable fact. The great champion of Rome, Cardinal Bellarmine, produced a passage from Tertullian as a clear proof of Purgatory; that passage is clear for Purgatory; but in that very place Tertullian says that he learned that from Montanus (a

wretched fanatic who believed himself to be the Holy Ghost!). Might we not well express our horror at a Cardinal of Rome seeking to impose upon Christians a doctrine of Tertullian's, which Tertullian himself says he had learned from Montanus? We now ask Mr. Power, "is it not strange?"

We have nowhere said that *everything* contained in the books written by Tertullian after he became a Montanist was taken from Montanus, nor do we think Mr. Collette has ever said so, though we shall not presume to interfere as far as Mr. Collette's letter is concerned, that gentleman being well able to defend himself; but when we see that Tertullian does expressly say that he learned the doctrine of Purgatory from Montanus (see vol. i., p. 67, col. 3, at the foot), then we do object to *any* proof of Purgatory brought from the writings of Tertullian after he became a Montanist; and we think it not creditable in professing Christians to quote such a proof. At the same time we think it quite open to ourselves, or to Mr. Collette, to show that *many* of the passages which are produced from Tertullian to prove Purgatory do not prove it at all. One passage, we admit, does speak of Purgatory, but that one professes to be the teaching of Montanus.

We have nowhere asserted that the Church of Rome has defined that prayers for the dead, or sacrifice offered for the dead, can only be for the sake of getting souls out of Purgatory; but we have complained, over and over again, that almost every Roman Catholic controversialist that we meet with, both in their own books, and also in our own pages, does argue, not only as if the Church of Rome *had* defined this, but as if it were a thing so clear that even Protestants must admit it. Is not this the common way that all Roman Catholics argue about Purgatory? They produce a passage which speaks simply of "prayer for the dead," or "sacrifice for the dead," and they expect us to take that as proof of Purgatory! To that we have always answered that these prayers might have been for a very different object besides getting the souls out of Purgatory; and, therefore, that such prayers were no proof of Purgatory, unless it could be shown that the prayer was intended to refer to Purgatory—a thing that never can be shown, because not one of the ancient forms of prayer for the dead ever makes any mention of Purgatory. Hitherto we have found that Roman Catholics were very slow to admit the fairness of this answer of ours; they seem always inclined to stick to the one notion, "there is a prayer for the dead, and that must mean Purgatory;" which, of course, can be no argument at all, unless it be supposed that prayer for the dead *can be for no other purpose* except to get the soul out of Purgatory. And it is this which makes us so much delighted now to see that our argument has at last succeeded, and that its force is now admitted by so intelligent a writer as Mr. Power. We beg leave to thank Mr. Power again for his clear admission; and we hope all our correspondents in future will remember it.

Mr. Power makes the same admission, also, about "sacrifice for the dead;" and we thank him for that too. Sacrifice for the dead is no proof of Purgatory, unless it can be shown that the sacrifice was offered for that purpose to get a soul out of Purgatory. Now, will Mr. Power produce to us any passage, from any ancient form of offering for the dead, *which professes to make the offering for that purpose?* We ask him can he, or can he not, produce such a passage? Until he, or some one else can produce such a passage, we are justified on his authority in saying, that "offering for the dead" is no proof for Purgatory.

Whether the ancient notion of the Christian sacrifice, or offering, be the same as that now held in the Church of Rome, is too large a question to go into now; we will treat that separately again. But if the modern Roman notion be the true one—namely, that it is "a propitiatory sacrifice for sin"—then for what purpose can it be offered, except to free the soul from the punishment of sin? Will Mr. Power undertake to answer this?

Whether St. Anthony and St. Francis, &c., were saints or not, is a question which we are not much disposed to judge of. We leave that to God. Considering how many lying stories we have read about them, and how stoutly the claims of some to sainthood were denied by great numbers of Roman Catholics, the question becomes quite too perplexing for us.

But Mr. Power says, "to pray for a saint with the notion that he was in need of the suffrages of the Church, can be no more repugnant to the Catholic doctrine, than it would be to offer sacrifice and prayer for the damned." Can this argument be serious? Can "prayer for the damned" be "the prayer of faith?" and, if not, what is it? Might we not as well pray for the devil; as poor "Uncle Toby," in the exercise of a charity, more sentimental than believing, was almost tempted to? And *can* it be any justification of the practices of Rome that they are *not worse* than this? Yet how natural, in those who quote Origen in proof of Purgatory!

But Mr. Power quotes St. Augustine, to prove, that if praying for the damned can do no good to the dead, it may to the living! Aye, and if St. Augustine lived now, he might say that in earnest; for sure it is by that they get their living!

The passage which Mr. Power quotes from St. Cyril

(Myst. v.) does *not* speak of the invocation of saints, as Mr. Power says—that passage makes no allusion at all to invocation; and the *intercession* it speaks of is very different from what the Church of Rome means; there is a great difference between "intercession" with invocation, and without it. Many Protestants believe it to be very probable that God's people, who are at rest, do, in their prayers, remember His people who are still contending with the world; we have no means of knowing, with certainty, whether this be so or not; some things seem to make it likely; we find no fault with those who think it likely. But it is a very different matter when we are told that *we must pray to them*, in order that they may intercede for us; and this is exactly what St. Cyril does *not* say in this passage; he says not one word of invocation of saints.

We have no objection to the prayer of St. Cyril's liturgy, "that he may make the bread the body of Christ;" we no more object to these words than we do to the words of Christ himself, "this is my body;" the question is, in what sense did St. Cyril understand these words? There are two ways of understanding them; some think the bread is made the sign and sacrament of the body of Christ, and that in that sense it is called his body; others think that it is turned into his body. Both parties agree in applying to the bread the words, "this is my body;" but it is clear that they must differ as to the sense in which those words are applied. Now, what did Cyril think of this? Did he think that the bread was the actual body of Christ itself; or the sign of that body? Whichever way he thought about this, it is clear he must have understood the words, "this is my body," in a corresponding sense. Now, in this very sermon, which Mr. Power quotes, St. Cyril says—"When we taste, we are bidden to taste not bread and wine, but *THE SIGN* of the body and blood of Christ." This is a way of speaking that no Roman Catholic ever uses; because they feel that speaking in this way is, in fact, giving up the doctrine of transubstantiation; yet, this was the way that St. Cyril thought fit to speak; and it is, therefore, clear that he must have understood the words in his liturgy, "to make this bread the body of Christ," in that very sense in which Protestants understand the words of Christ; for, after this prayer has been offered, he still calls the bread, "the sign of the body."

Mr. Power is very much mistaken, indeed, in supposing that Aetius was the only person in the early Church who questioned the efficacy of prayer for the dead; and we do think that Mr. Power should not have made such an assertion after reading that sermon of St. Cyril, which he quotes; for, in the very next sentence to that which Mr. Power has quoted, St. Cyril does say, "I know that many do say, what is a soul profited which departs from this world either with sins or without sins, if it be commemorated in the prayer." St. Cyril does not say that these persons have departed from the faith; nor does he answer them from the doctrine of the Church; he merely tries to answer them by arguments drawn from the conduct of earthly kings; and the way the word *commemorate* is used in this passage, applied alike to those who depart with sin, or without sin, goes far to destroy the distinction which Mr. Power endeavours to draw as to the use of that word.

We trust that for the future it will be remembered, that neither prayer nor sacrifice for the dead afford any proof for Purgatory, unless it can be directly shown that the prayer or sacrifice was actually intended to get a soul out of Purgatory. Only let this be attended to, and we shall have few such passages brought forward as proofs of Purgatory.

We think we have some reason to complain of the terms in which Mr. Power speaks of our quoting the Council of Trent in "such a mutilated and spurious shape, that the original could not be recognised." We can assure him we had no intention to misrepresent either the Roman Catholic doctrines, or the Council of Trent. We cited, of course, merely as much as was necessary to elucidate our purpose, and gave those words only which applied to the particular subject of which we were treating.

If Mr. Power is disposed to write an "essay," in reply to our articles on the invocation of saints, we shall be very happy to hear from him, and to defend every proposition we have put forward on the subject; but we anticipate that Mr. Power will find it just as hard to reconcile the decree of the Council of Trent with the writings of his favourite author, Origen, as we have done.

FLOWERS FOR NOVEMBER.

Yes; even in dreary, dark November, we are not without our flowers; and though many are dead and gone, others still appear in that wonderful and regular succession which a kind and merciful Creator has ordained. A November sky, however gloomy, cannot deter the LAUREL (*Cerasus lauro*) from opening its bright-looking flowers, as cheerfully as if they were to meet the clear sunshine of June; and, with its kindred shrub the Portugal Laurel, it will continue flowering till the spring has introduced her train of gay attendants. The common Laurel is a native of the south of Europe, and its leaves are poisonous. The Laurel of the poets, and with which the victorious generals of Rome were rewarded, is not our common Laurel, but the sweet bay tree (*Lauro nobilis*), an evergreen worthy of

its high distinction from the elegance of its form and the aromatic fragrance of its leaves. The Laurel has always been the emblem of glory. The crown of Laurel wreathed the conqueror's brow. St. Peter tells us that when the Prince of Pastors shall appear, those pastors who feed the flock of God, taking care of it, and being made *patterns for the flock*, shall receive a never-fading crown of glory. Of what materials shall that crown be composed which is for those pastors, who are patterns to their flocks of cursing on the Sabbath-day from the altar, denouncing to death and destruction their neighbours and fellow-countrymen? Can such be the pastors spoken of by St. Peter?—1st Epistle v. 2-4.

The LAURISTINUS is another shrub of great beauty that cheers us now with its wintry blossoms of purplish red, tinged with white. When fully expanded, its flowers are almost entirely white, and in the midst of its evergreen leaves their clusters form an agreeable contrast; dark blue berries succeed the flowers. The Lauristinus is a native of southern Europe, and found on the hills and plains of northern Africa. It was introduced among us about the year 1596. Its ancient name was *Tinus*, and its leaves being evergreen, and like the laurel it was called Lauristinus. Its botanical name is *Viturnum tinus*.

The SNOWBERRY (*Symphoricarpos racemosa*) is another elegant bushy shrub, which favours our November with its small white or rose-coloured flowers. It is a native of both North and South America, but has long since become a favourite ornament in the foreground of our shrubberies. It is not an evergreen, but rather a delicate deciduous shrub. It bears two crops of flowers and an abundance of snowy berries or fruit. The PYRACANTHUS (*Crataegus*)—or fiery thorn—is another beautiful shrub, bearing a rich profusion of scarlet berries, like those of the mountain ash in their winter splendour. They remain throughout the severest part of the season, and only fall when spring provides a fresh relief.

The MICHAELMAS DAISY (*Aster Trides cante*), with its large purple flowers and yellow disk, a native of the fields of Virginia, generally lingers in our gardens to the end of this month, and then departs. There is another herbaceous plant of the same name, but a native of our own isles (ASTER TRIPOLIUM, or SEA STARWORT), a blue daisy, with lilac flowers. It was supposed to change its colours three times in the day—to have been white in the morning, purple at noon, and crimson in the afternoon—whence the Greeks gave it its name of TRIPOLIUM. But we cannot find any evidence of those changes in our sober climate.

If we wish to add a more sprightly flower to our winter nosegay, we have at hand the last representative of the Rose, the monthly or Chinese rose (*Rosa Indica*), whose delicate and odiferous flowers never looked more pure or engaging than they do now, emblematic of beauty, always new. We may add to our wreath the flowers of the EVERLASTING, a most interesting family of plants, consisting of many members—

"That look as infants do, who smile when dead."

all remarkable for the property of retaining their beauty for years after they are pulled, if gathered in dry weather. One of these is the CUDWEED, of which there are nine or ten varieties in Ireland. Their botanical name is *Gnaphalium*, from the soft down with which their leaves are clothed. The common Cudweed (*Gnaphalium Germanicum*) is found on sandy heaths, its stem and foliage covered by a soft woolly down. The yellow species, called, by the Parisians, "Immortelle," and met with at every step in that most romantic resting-place for the dead, the Cemetery of Pere la Chaise, is the *Gnaphalium Orientale*, a native of Africa and Asia, growing wild on the slopes of Lebanon and Carmel. There is something very touching in the display of sentiment evinced by that gay, and perhaps giddy people, when you see the graves, which have evidently closed upon their tenants several years since, freshly decked with wreaths of the Everlasting, their blossoms dyed of a deeper yellow, and intermingled with others of a jet black, and carefully renewed year by year—fitting emblems of never-ceasing remembrance.

There is another plant which passes by the name of Everlasting, the Xeranthemum, or dry flower, which also retains its brightness and colour for many months after it is gathered. The purple, white, and yellow Xeranthemums are popular annuals among us now, and are natives of southern Europe.

Another annual flower, also entitled to the name of Everlasting is the IMMORTAL AMARANTH (*Gomphrenia globosa*). Its name indicates its immunity from decay. Milton represents the angels as crowned with it:—

"Their crowns inwove with amarant and gold—
Immortal amarant: a flower which once
In paradise, fast by the tree of life
Began to bloom."

The French call it "Violette Immortelle;" and it appears to have been dedicated, by the early Greeks, to the same funeral purpose to which the Parisians apply the *Gnaphalium*. Homer introduces the wreath of *Amaranth* as used at the burial of Achilles. He was a hero and demi-god; and, perhaps, thought worthy of immortality—not the lot of meaner men. The heathen notion of immortality was a narrow one, an indistinct glimmer of truth, till "the illumination (or appearing) of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath destroyed death, and hath brought to light life and incorruption (immortality), by the Gospel."—1 Timothy i. 10.